EXHIBIT 2

```
1
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
                   THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
 2
 3
 4 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 5
            Plaintiff,
                                      Criminal Action
 6
                                      No. 03-10038-GAO
   vs.
 7
 8 LAWRENCE GUZMAN,
 9
            Defendant.
10
11
12
                     TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING
13
           BEFORE THE HONORABLE GEORGE A. O'TOOLE, JR.
14
                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
                   United States District Court
16
                  John J. Moakley U.S. Courthouse
                          1 Courthouse Way
17
                   Boston, Massachusetts 02210
                          October 24, 2003
18
                             10:00 a.m.
19
20
21
22
                       SHELLY M. KILLIAN, CM
23
                      Official Court Reporter
                 John J. Moakley U.S. Courthouse
24
                    1 Courthouse Way, Room 3510
                         Boston, MA 02210
25
                           (617) 737-7117
```

```
1 APPEARANCES:
 2 For the Plaintiff:
 3 Peter Levitt
   United States Attorney's Office
 4 John Joseph Moakley Federal Courthouse
   1 Courthouse Way, Suite 9200
 5 Boston, Massachusetts 02210
 6 For the Defendant:
 7 Carl N. Donaldson, Esq.
   327 Summer Street
 8 Boston, Massachusetts 02110
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
2.4
25
```

PROCEEDINGS

(The following proceedings were held in open court before the Honorable George A. O'Toole, Jr., United States
District Judge, United States District Court, District of
Massachusetts, at the John J. Moakley United States Courthouse,
1 Courthouse Way, Boston, Massachusetts, on October 24, 2003.

The defendant, Lawrence Guzman, is present with counsel. Assistant United States Attorney Peter Levitt is present.)

THE CLERK: All rise. Criminal 03-10038, United States versus Lawrence Guzman.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ LEVITT: Good morning, your Honor. Peter Levitt on behalf of the United States.

MR. DONALDSON: Good morning, your Honor. Carl Donaldson on behalf of Mr. Lawrence Guzman.

THE COURT: Mr. Guzman appears this morning for sentencing on his conviction, one count of distribution of cocaine, violation of 21 U.S. Code Section 841(a)(1) and 18 U.S. Code Section 2. I have a final presentence report. It's been submitted by the probation office, and I gather the parties have had an opportunity to review the report in the final form that it's been submitted?

MR. LEVITT: That's correct, your Honor.

MR. DONALDSON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: In addition, I have a motion from the

government, a memorandum on sentencing from the government, and a memorandum from the defendant with respect to sentencing. I think that completes the papers that I should have.

MR. DONALDSON: Yes, your Honor.

MR. LEVITT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: As I've reviewed the papers, it appears to me that there is no controversy between the parties as to the guideline range, and the subject is what extent of departure, if any, ought to be provided. Is that a fair statement?

MR. LEVITT: That's correct, your Honor.

MR. DONALDSON: Yes, your Honor. That's fine.

THE COURT: Then I think we might as well get right to the main issue. And let me just say I have reviewed the PSR. I adopt the offense conduct statement that's set forth therein, and on the basis of that I conclude that the career offender guideline produces -- taking account of a three-level adjustment of acceptance of responsibility -- a level 29 and a criminal history category 6, which will yield a presumptive guideline range of 151 to 188 months.

Mr. Levitt, the government's motion?

MR. LEVITT: Thank you, your Honor. The government recommends a 20 percent reduction from the mid range of the guideline provision that results in a term of imprisonment of 133 months. There's really -- the government's position is

laid out, I think, pretty well in the motion for a downward departure. I'll just highlight a few of the points.

There are two considerations from the government's perspective. One is the fact that the defendant did provide cooperation. The defendant has been a government cooperating witness since approximately 1999. His cooperation -- he assisted in his cooperation -- assisted the FBI in arresting four individuals, two of whom pled guilty, two of whom were convicted at trial. The defendant testified at trial.

The defendant also provided corroborating incrimination sentencing with respect to drug weight with respect to five other individuals. The individuals that the defendant cooperated against were gang members. They're dangerous people. The defendant did put himself at risk in cooperating. That's the reason for the 5K1.

The reason that the 5K1 is 20 percent as opposed to more is that the defendant, while a cooperating witness for the government, unbeknownst to the government was dealing drugs. He also was involved in an armed robbery. He repeatedly lied to the FBI. He repeatedly lied to the U.S. Attorney's Office. He admitted that he lied about his own drug use at sentencing -- at the sentencing hearings that he was engaged in with respect to the LGD case -- that's a gang case -- all of which the government has disclosed to various defense counsel.

The -- in this respect, really the defendant broke

a sacred trust between the government and its cooperating witnesses. This was his drug -- the fact that he was dealing drugs and the robbery was disclosed to the government by a defendant that he cooperated against. The government, to confirm whether this was the case or not, tried to make a controlled buy from the defendant and was easily able to do it. And the defendant bragged during the controlled buy about being able to get the undercover state trooper as much cocaine as he wanted.

So the government, sort of balancing both of these considerations, has made a recommendation that is significantly less than what it would be if the defendant had simply done what he was supposed to do, done what he agreed to do, which was to cooperate and not to violate the law while he was cooperating. So the government's recommendation again is 133 months. Thank you.

THE COURT: When you say it's a reduction of 20 percent, you're measuring from the mid point of the range, not from the low end?

MR. LEVITT: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Donaldson?

MR. DONALDSON: Good morning, your Honor. If it pleases the Court, I have respectfully requested that he have a departure from the guidelines based upon several issues, three of which I've pointed out in my memorandum in aid of

sentencing.

2.1

The first, your Honor, is basically the fact that based upon the information that we have and based upon the basic evidence that also came out in the presentence report, indicates that Mr. Guzman was imperfectly entrapped into this sale that brings him before the Court today. And I believe that the facts of the case law fit perfectly within that category.

Mr. Guzman was introduced -- well, Mr. Guzman introduced this specific confidential informant to the government and had him become a confidential informant himself. Not only did he introduce him, but he had been a long-time friend because the mother of his children was related to the confidential informant by way of his mother's -- the children's mother's sister, and they were boyfriend and girlfriend. So he had a close and confidential relationship with him.

As pointed out, your Honor, in the cases that is one of the things where it appears that there may have been some overreaching by the government with respect to getting this particular confidential informant to solicit Mr. Guzman to sell drugs to an undercover government agent.

Your Honor, the other issue is the fact that Mr. Guzman was considered by the street gangs and -- by the street gangs as a snitch or a person who has turned on the

gangs. And he broke some codes and some rules of the street, which is to turn in evidence on someone else and to also testify.

In fact, while he was here testifying, he had received at least one threat in the mail by an individual who basically says, you know, I know where you are. In fact, you know, when they say that, you know, the Bureau of Prisons are adequately set up to remedy this situation. He was, in fact, brought up here on the same bus with the individuals that he was testifying against from Plymouth County Correctional Facility. So I'm not sure that there is a safe way. And the fact that the gangs are so heavily entrenched in the Bureau of Prisons, it would appear to me that it would be not a facility in these particular areas that would basically keep Mr. Guzman from any unreasonable harm. Of course, he's always going to have the threat of some form of victimization.

Your Honor, and I do -- I do apologize. I did have a typo there. I put that he aided in 46 individuals. That's not correct. My brother, he mentions nine. I believe it's more than nine. The presentence reports states I think 17 or 18 individuals, but I do know that he did at least testify against two. I watched one full testimony against that individual. The last one, which was in May, that was the time that he was threatened. Those are the times that he came up here on the same bus from the correctional department or from

the prison, from Plymouth County Department of Corrections with the same individual. He was harassed on the bus on the way up here, he tells me, and on the way back.

Lastly, your Honor, I would indicate that his criminal history category overrepresents the crimes that he is -- has pled guilty for. And the category clearly overrepresents his activity -- his past behavior. Because of the guidelines, he is a level 29, category 6. Mr. Guzman was involved in two threats to his girlfriend and one to her boyfriend. One was November of 2001 and one was December of 2001. Both of those cases were combined and he pled those cases together.

He is doing concurrent time for those cases together. When I say concurrent time, he basically received a probation sentence. That probation sentence was basically a very, very low level probation sentence, although it was -- he was on probation until the year 2004. The low level probation sentence, one of which he did not have to report to probation, so it was unsupervised probation. The other one he spent approximately 27 days in jail.

Your Honor, there is no -- there is no issue, you know, that he would commit those crimes again. He was -- he basically caught himself out of his jealousy. He basically caught himself from doing that. He kept himself respectful after the last time. He knew that he was working for the

government. He tried to remain respectful to the government and to, you know, the court system with respect to his promise not to abuse or not to harass or not to threaten his children's mother.

Now, the government indicates that Mr. Guzman abused his trust. Mr. Guzman tells me that for the most part the government knew that his ability to infiltrate these gangs required him to have some level of trust with the gangs himself. Some of those levels of trust will require him to do some things that he has told me, and basic street knowledge with respect to the gangs is some form of camaraderie.

Generally, when you infiltrate these gangs, when you have some type of relationship with these gang members, your Honor, guys get together, they talk, they start to smoke marijuana or they do drugs together. Mr. Guzman indicates that there was no way that they would trust him if he didn't get high with them. And he indicates that the government knew that he was getting high with them.

Now, I'm not sure to what level anyone knew that he was getting high with them, with the gang members, but what I can say is that to some degree there, you know, there's a close relationship with the government and Mr. Guzman, and then there is a close relationship with Mr. Guzman and the gang members. It's strong knowledge that in order to hang out with some of these gang members, you do have to have some trust.

One of the topics or one of the key marks that will set them off is why doesn't this guy -- you know, he's different. He's not getting high. Can we trust him? He's not touching any of this stuff. Mr. Guzman feels that that is one of the reasons why he had to do it. He was predisposed to do drugs because he had done drugs in the past, and he caught himself doing drugs.

With respect to a breach -- in breaching this trust, your Honor, that's the only time that he felt that he breached any trust. He indicates that he had never been selling drugs. In fact, if it was true that he was selling drugs and it was known on the streets that he was selling drugs, it would have been a lot easier and a lot cleaner and a lot safer for the government to get someone else to get him to serve as someone other than a confidential friend, especially a friend that he used or introduced to the government himself. There was an area of trust there.

Mr. Guzman tells me that the reason why he did it — one of the reasons why he did it was because he thought that this is somebody that they could set up later and provide information to the government. In fact, I don't know if it's been brought out by my brother, but Mr. Guzman started working with the government in 1999. He was told shortly after a couple times he gave information to the government that he didn't really have to do it anymore. But he decided to

continue to help the government because he wanted the government to understand that he didn't appreciate all the drug activity.

In fact, where he lived there were people who were selling drugs right across the street from him, and his children were outside playing, cars driving up. So he wanted to clean up his neighborhood. He wanted to basically clean up the city. So he continued on, even though the government told him they didn't need him to do it anymore. He continued to help the government. And then, you know, within three months of his last trial that he was going to testify with, he was basically set up by the government by one of his friends to sell drugs to an undercover officer.

Now, Mr. Guzman tells me that he had -- was expecting money from the government, that he hadn't received any money for some period of time, and that one of the other reasons that he did it is because Valentine's Day was coming by. He did not have any money and he knew that he could make some money from that and that's one of the other reasons why he did it.

His confidential friend told him that this is a person that he needed to have serviced. He needed to have him serviced that day. There was no way that they could let this guy get away. This guy was a big spender and that he had nobody that he could use to service him at this time.

Mr. Guzman was actually on his way to spend time with his children, and after the pressure and the overall continued request that his friend asked him to service this gentleman, who ended up being an undercover officer for the government, Mr. Guzman relented and said that he would.

Based upon all that information, your Honor, I would suggest that Mr. Guzman -- and looking at the totality of the circumstances -- should not be a category 6, level 29 and that this Court has the authority to depart from the guidelines and that they should to provide justice with respect to Mr. Guzman in his sentencing. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Levitt, do you want to respond briefly?

MR. LEVITT: Yes, briefly, your Honor. The government's not -- didn't prosecute Mr. Guzman for using drugs with gang members. The government did not reduce its substantial assistance recommendation for the defendant using drugs with gang members.

The defendant prosecuted the defendant -- the government prosecuted the defendant for selling drugs. The information the government got from two defendants was that Mr. Guzman was selling drugs on the streets for money, not using drugs. The government was able to after the second piece of information the government got with respect to that, the government was able to make a buy from the defendant within two

days. That's how easy it was because -- and the government submits that it was easy because the defendant was on the streets actively selling drugs.

The defendant also, again, was involved in an armed robbery of a drug dealer while he was acting as a cooperating witness. The defendant suggests that the reason he was cooperating was to try to clean up the streets of Lawrence. The defendant was paid \$11,000 for cooperating with the government. The defendant also had a -- got assistance from the government in connection with state cases he had. The government brought to the District Attorney's office his intention of his cooperation. The marijuana case was quashed. He also got his license back and got no jail time on the threats and assault and battery.

The last thing with respect to the criminal history category issues -- there are actually two last points. The defendant has three predicate career offender convictions, from June of '98, December '01 and February '02. Two of those involved a gun. One was assault and battery with a dangerous weapon, a handgun. One was threatening to commit murder. One was threatening and assault and battery in which he showed a gun. The criminal history category clearly meets the career offender definitions.

With respect to the issue of the defendant's protection in prison, the government -- the Bureau of Prisons

does this all the time. It protects snitches. It segregates them. I'm going to ask Mr. Donaldson at the conclusion of this hearing to provide me with a list of all of the individuals that he believes the defendant should be segregated from, and we'll provide that to the Bureau of Prisons. That's done all the time. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Guzman -- Mr. Donaldson, if you have something else -- I was going to invite Mr. Guzman to say anything he wanted, but go ahead and go first.

MR. DONALDSON: I would only indicate that the three state cases that Mr. Guzman pled guilty to, those -- of those three cases, he pled guilty to one of them. He was assisted by counsel. The other two he was not, in fact, assisted by counsel.

In fact, one of the agents for the state, police officer -- Detective Brooks from the Lawrence Police Department went into court with Mr. Guzman. Mr. Guzman waived his right to counsel and he pled to sufficient facts. And I took a strong, close look at the transcript. The transcript did not indicate that Mr. Guzman had a correct and qualified Massachusetts Rules, criminal rules, 12(B)(5) colloquy hearing. I brought that to the Court's attention by a motion to reopen the case, and I gave the transcript to the Court.

In the transcript, your Honor, the motion -- the statements had -- they were extremely short of what is

required. Massachusetts requires a probing of the mind as well as all the other Courts, your Honor. And the Court denied that motion. I am at this time, once I get the tape transcript, also filing to have that case reviewed.

And I would just say that given those circumstances, your Honor, I don't believe that Mr. Guzman wants -- once the single justice reviews it, I don't believe that Mr. Guzman would be in that category anyway because those cases would be reopened. There is not -- it's just one witness against the other. There is really not any corroborating witnesses who are going to testify either for Mr. Guzman or against Mr. Guzman. And I believe that Mr. Guzman will prevail on those cases; that is, if the Commonwealth decides to bring those cases after the case gets reopened.

THE COURT: Mr. Guzman, you have the opportunity to say something now. You don't have to if you don't wish to, but you have the chance to do so if you wish.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I'd like to say I spent three and a half to four years trying to work for the FBI, collaboration to take down gangs. I do admit I had a substance abuse problem and I did relapse during occasions of buying, selling drugs. And also I don't see how I could fall into a category of a career criminal, sir, when all I've done for four years is try to work for the FBI and do the right thing.

I know I did fall. I did fall and I'm trying to

clear myself of that. I did use drugs and I did plead guilty to selling drugs to an undercover, but I feel I was entrapped. I also feel, your Honor, that I haven't had one opportunity to express myself in this whole case. I feel I have been wrongly, wrongly, wrongly done by the people I worked for, including the FBI agents and the government.

I have two beautiful kids that are waiting for me. The most I've done is just threaten people. I never harmed anybody. I never hurt anyone. The things I have done, I have done wrong and I do admit to them, but I don't feel I should fall under career criminal category.

I put my life in danger for my government several times, my family's life and my children's life. To this day I'm still in danger. I'm marked. I'm everything, when I'm in prison and out there. I have surpassed not one but two gangs. I've testified against one and miraculously happened to put efforts toward another bringing them down. I sat in this Court last year and testified against the LGD gang and now this year against the Latin Outlaws.

And I throw myself on the mercy of the Court today and hope that you can see both my way of life on the street and in respect to what I have done for the government. Thank you, your Honor.

MR. DONALDSON: Your Honor, Mr. Guzman's father indicated that he would also like to address the Court.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GUZMAN: Sorry. This is my first time in court. Please give me a couple seconds.

THE COURT: Take your time.

MR. GUZMAN: I know my son broke the law. He had to pay for what he's doing. I know he not do nothing right. I fight with him. I try to help but they go with the people, take away from me. I tried to send him out to the Army but the people keep it going every day. I try to get out. All the time he tell me, Pa, you don't know what you say. I never go to jail because I do -- because I do a lot of good deal for the person, for the government person. What my son doing is not casuality (sic). It's abuse of the power. He use an innocent person.

Know what I say is what I say and the Court in the record why he have a problem when he got framed, he go to the court. They broke -- never let it alone. The government never let he alone in the court. He go with Laurie. Tell him what he doing, why he do it, why he do it, why he go to the court because he need -- he live in Lawrence. They declared guilty.

Why one officer law have to go one criminal person in the court? And he tell him why he do it because somebody tell him you say the truth, you be free. That's what he say. He had to say the truth for only the -- the other side have to say the truth, too.

My son misabuse of the power. For four year when he catch the first time with drug, he supposed to use of the law, send it out to the jail. Today my son was a different person but he go out a boy, a criminal, like you call the people here. He bailed it out. Twenty-four seven he called my house, hey, yo, yo home? What's really the law? They won't see this world, this nation like example. For me I don't see that way because I suffer. I fight for my son to save him, and all the time somebody take it away from me. I know my son.

But the government take it away from me to do the job.

I feel proud that he do in Lawrence, take him off the gang. Why the FBI and the police get a good pay and not do their job? No, they use an innocent person. They use an innocent person. Now, they use him. They don't need him. He used. I can't hang everything because he know inside out what he did, but he was another person in catching the -- he was a long time in the street because the government know what that really person is.

He say when I explain I only selling drug for a couple of months. He's a liar. Laurie sell drug for a long time and the FBI and the police know he's selling drug because if you are not selling drug, he never be working with the FBI. This is a reality. The police they know he selling drug. Why he let it go? Why? Why he not catch it and put in the jail where he supposed to be? No. He wait to finger the -- he

wanted to finger to put him in the jail. I lie or seek to tell the truth. That's what it's truth. Absolutely everybody got a record.

I'm poor guy but I never broke the law. Even for being down low. I pay my taxes for 35 years. I buy a home. I work hard to give a decent house. I tried to send to the Marine. I send to the Army. I tried to send it out to recuperation group, but all the time the telephone ring, take it away. He give him morning, every Friday, he give him money to him to buy drug. Sometime he cried to his mother say, Ma, pray for me because I want to go some party in Haverhill for that people. I don't know say I want to return.

Sometime he come with one big picture, the one guy help because the government force him to do it. Now, after the government finished and put the gang away, now he's a thorn for him. The government know he selling drug for a long time. The government know he broke the law. The government know what he doing before now. They catch him with drug and bring it over here. Everybody know. Why now? Because this is a poor guy. I'm poor man. I don't have the money to defend myself.

No, I have a couple dollar for my retirement. I'm 58 years old. I don't have no more power to work, but I work very decent to grow a decent house. He never see me drink a beer.

I pay for his school. I tried to do my best for my daughter for college. The old house is for me, for my family, for my

grandchildren.

Why you call it crime with Laurie. What do people do to Laurie? How do we want to call it? Abuse of the power or crime? I think it is not fair what he doing to Laurie. Even he tried to open the case on Laurie. You know what a D.A. doing when he get out of the jail? The court, oh, I do good. You know why? Because he know Laurie. He know Laurie. He know Laurie. He open the case easy because really. Brooke tell Laurie you have to declare guilty, that way he can take it away and come back to the street.

Your Honor, I don't know how to speak very clear, but I speak it from my heart. You see, I haven't the money to defend Laurie. You do whatever you can. I do it. But is it powerful people against Laurie. Who it is, no. Because Laurie do good job for the society. Laurie put a lot of criminal away with criminal. The police, the FBI, no one want to do it. Laurie he sell drug for the FBI. He do everything. You know, this is the best city in the world. Every nation look at America to take example, but what happens in this case go in the public? If I have the money, this is my way, get to the public because maybe he no want to say, maybe I don't say, but maybe other people, other boy, other family he want to be.

This is my world. Sorry my English but --

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Guzman.

MR. GUZMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Well, this is an unusual case, I think in various respects, including the step away from the government's perspective of recognizing the assistance and yet prosecuting the offense creates an interesting tension. I will grant the government's 5K1 motion, and I think it's probably appropriate to select a reduction factor that reflects the criminal activity that is the root of the conviction here, that is, a lesser one than would normally be awarded.

On the other hand, I have to agree that the -- in this -- in the particular circumstances of this case, the enhancement that is worked by the application of the career offender guideline is an enormous one given what would be the offense level if that had not happened. Apart from whether anything happens with the Lawrence District Court, assuming the validity of those, which I do because they are valid at this stage anyway, the offense level would have been under what the non-career offender computation would have been. I believe, a level 12, category three, which is 15 to 21 months, which is a vast difference from what the career offender is.

So the question, I think, presents itself whether the criminal history, which leads to the application of the career offender guideline, is the kind of criminal history that the guideline authors had in mind when they made that degree of enhancement. And I don't think it is. It seems to me that a multiple of ten at the bottom end is -- I don't say this simply

as a mathematical matter, but it just gives an idea of the proportionate supercharging that gets done by the offender guideline.

In some cases, you can easily see the pattern in the criminal history that you can, I guess, recognize that the enhancement is appropriate and can be justified. I recognize that the criminal history includes the use of weapons, the carrying of weapons anyway, and threats which if carried out would be very serious crimes. I note that even in the Lawrence District Court, though, where the primary events were played out, the disposition is on the light side.

Having sat in the Massachusetts District Courts, I know that at times unsupervised probation is a disposition but it is not a common one, at least it wasn't in my experience.

And it's unusual, I think, that an unsupervised probation would be the response to a situation where there seemed to be a threat of the use of a weapon. Now, I don't know what went through the sentencing judge's mind in those cases, but I have a record which the signals point downward rather than upward.

So I think that calls for a further departure than is requested by the government. Whether this is a -- well, whether I need authority to depart once I departed, I don't know. It may be that we're simply debating the extent of the departure under 5K1, although I guess I'm frank to say that I would not, if I were considering only substantial assistance, I

would not depart as far as I will depart.

б

So analytically, I'm not sure how it can be done.

So I guess I should say that I think that the criminal history produced by the career offender overstates the criminal history in this case. I don't think that means going back to the unenhanced guideline range.

PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, I was just going to comment that there's a specific guideline provision 3(A)1.1 to give the Court authority to depart on the basis of overstatement of criminal --

THE COURT: I'm aware of that. Thank you.

I guess my point is I'm not sure whether I have to invoke that as a strict matter when I've already departed from the range for another reason and we're debating the extent of the departure. It may be that since I have said that, I will not depart as far as I will only because of the substantial assistance, maybe I do have to. So I appreciate you pointing that out.

But, as I was saying -- so I'm not going to ignore the career offender. I think there should be some enhancement. And I think that under all the circumstances a just sentence in this case would be one -- I would depart from -- I'll stay mechanically within the table and depart from the level 29 in category 6 to a level 19 in category 6, which produces a guideline range of 63 to 78 months, and impose a

sentence at the low end of that range for 63 months. That's more than five years, and I think under the circumstances, that's an appropriate sentence in this case.

So, Mr. Guzman, if you'd stand, please.

Upon your conviction of this offense and pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of this Court that you be and you hereby are committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 63 months. I will make a recommendation that you be considered for participation in the 500-hour comprehensive drug treatment program. I would also recommend that you be considered for participation in an anger management program, if offered, at the Bureau of Prisons facility to which you have been assigned.

Upon your release from imprisonment, you shall be placed on supervised release for a term of three years. Within 72 hours of your release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, you shall report in person to the district to which you have been released.

While you're on supervised release, you shall not commit another federal, state or local crime. You shall refrain from the unlawful use of a controlled substance and shall submit to a drug test within 15 days of your release from imprisonment and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter as may be directed by the probation office.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You shall comply with all the standard conditions that pertain to the status of supervised release. Those standard conditions are set forth in the sentencing guidelines at section 5D1.3(c) and they're incorporated by reference. You shall comply, in addition, with the following special conditions: You're prohibited from possessing a firearm or other dangerous weapon. During your supervised release, you shall participate in any program for substance abuse, treatment or counseling as you may be directed to participate in by your probation officer, which program may include random testing to determine whether you have reverted to the use of alcohol or drugs. You shall be required to contribute to the cost of service for such treatment based on your ability to pay or on the availability of third-party reimbursement. You are to refrain from the consumption of alcoholic beverages during the course of your substance abuse treatment.

I will not impose a monetary fine. There is in addition to the penalties announced a mandatory special assessment in the sum of \$100 which shall be due forthwith.

THE COURT: All right, Phil.

THE CLERK: Marshal, the defendant is now in custody. You have the right to appeal. You have ten days to file. If you cannot afford an attorney, we will appoint an attorney for you. Mr. Marshal, the defendant is now in your custody.

(Court adjourned, 10:50 a.m.) CERTIFICATION I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my skill and ability. Shelly M. Killian Date Official Court Reporter